Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I ask who is this officer that is sought to be retired compulsorily?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" He is a gazetted officer. It is Mr. Krishna Ayyar, the Deputy Superintendent in the Coimbatore Central Jail."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I know what is the total service that he has put in?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" All that is under investigation."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I know whether there is any other person who has put in 25 or more than 30 years service and who is a gazetted officer and who will come under this rule?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" No other gazetted officer."

Desirability of abolishing the post of Personal Assistant to the Inspector-General of Prisons.

* 75 Q.—Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) when the post of the Personal Assistant to the Inspector-General of Prisons was created and why;

(b) what the annual cost is of the establishment of the Personal Assistant and the staff under him, if any;

(c) when the post of the Manager to the office of the Inspector-General of Prisons was created and why;

(d) what the duties are of the Manager of the office of the Inspector-General of Prisons;

(e) what the annual cost is of the establishment of the Manager and his staff, if any;

(f) whether the Government have considered the question of retrenchment in the office of the Inspector-General of Prisons;

(g) if so, on what lines, and what the total effect is;

(h) whether the attention of the Government has been drawn to the possibility of abolishing the post of the Personal Assistant to the Inspector-General of Prisons without detriment to efficiency; and

(i) if not, whether the Government propose to examine this question with a view to retrenchment?

A.—(a) From 1st April 1930. To relieve the Inspector-General of Prisons of most of the routine office work which has increased in recent years and to enable him to devote his attention to matters of greater importance.

(b) & (e) The hon. Member is referred to the half-yearly list of non-gazetted officers of the Jail Department and the certified schools. No separate staff has been sanctioned for the Personal Assistant or the Manager.

[3rd August 1932

(*c*) & (*d*) Over sixty years ago; for supervising the clerical and menial establishments of the Inspector-General's office.

(*f*) Yes.

(*g*) One temporary clerk on Rs. 35 a month was discontinued.

(*h*) & (*i*) The Government do not consider that the post of the Personal Assistant to the Inspector-General of Prisons can be abolished without detriment to efficiency. The Retrenchment Committee has recommended a reduction in the pay of the post and the recommendation is under the consideration of Government.

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed :—" May I ask when the post of Personal Assistant to the Inspector-General of Prisons was created? Is there any reason for the Government to think that from 1st April 1930 it would not be possible for the Inspector-General to carry on the work without the assistance of a Personal Assistant, although there was already a Manager of the office who was attending to all the duties? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar :—" Government think that both are necessary."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed :—" May I know what exactly is the nature of the work that has increased since 1930 to relieve which this Personal Assistant has been appointed? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar :—" The work was increasing not since 1930, but before that."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed :—" May I know if up to 1930 the Manager could have managed the whole office of the Inspector-General of Prisons, what exactly was the amount of additional work that justified the creation of the post of Personal Assistant? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar :—" It was because the Manager could not cope with the work that the Personal Assistant was appointed."

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar :—" May I know if the office of the Inspector-General of Prisons were to be removed from Ootacamund to Madras, the work can be better done and a Manager alone would be sufficient? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar :—" I do not know how this question arises out of the answer that I gave."

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar :—" What I said was that if the office of the Inspector-General of Prisons were removed to Madras, the Inspector-General himself would be better able to attend to his duties and thus there would be no necessity to have a Personal Assistant."

The hon. the President :—" The question is not whether the Inspector-General would be better able to attend to his duties if his office were removed to Madras. That question does not arise out of this motion. It has not been stated that the Inspector-General of Prisons has not been doing his duties properly."

3rd August 1932]

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—" It is claimed that the work is too heavy and he needs a Personal Assistant to attend to them. May I know what the reasons are for his stationing the office at Ootacamund and whether the removal of the office from Ootacamund to Madras will not give him more time to attend to his duties? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" It is impossible to answer that till the office is actually removed to Madras."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I know the nature of the additional work that has grown up in recent years?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" Notice."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I know whether the Government have considered the possibility of further retrenchment by reason of the abolition of some jails in the department? I mean the Central Jail at Alipuram."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" It is not a Central Jail."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" Yes, I corrected myself and said 'some jails'."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—" May I ask whether the Government have considered the possibility of amalgamating some of the certified schools in the district with the other school at Chingleput, and thereby effecting a retrenchment?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" It is not possible to amalgamate."

Prevalence of appendicitis among the Civil Disobedience prisoners.

* 76 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that a large number of civil disobedience prisoners suffered from appendicitis while in jails in the Presidency since the beginning of this year;

(*b*) if so, will the hon. Member state (i) their names, (ii) their class, (iii) the jails where they got the attack, (iv) the cause of their disease, (v) what treatment was given to each and where it was given and what the result was in each case; and

(*c*) what action the Government have taken or propose to take in the matter?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The Government have no information.

(*c*) The hon. Member is referred to rules 513–515 B and 573–581 of the Jail Manual regarding the treatment of sick prisoners in jails. The Government do not propose to take any action in the matter.